

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant responds herein to the Office Action of May 15, 2007. Claims 3-17 are currently pending in the Application. Claims 3-17 were rejected in the Office Action. Proposed amendments to the independent claims were discussed with the Examiner during the telephone interview on July 19, 2007. Applicant's attorney thanks the Examiner for the courtesy extended during the telephone interview. Accordingly, Applicant amended Claims 15 and 17 and respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection.

As discussed during the interview, Applicant amended Claims 15 and 17 to more particularly point out that Applicant's method and system of synchronizing remote clocks include a bi-directional exchange of time signals and a bi-directional exchange of measurement data, which includes time differences calculated at the central clock and the remote clock. Both time signals and calculated time differences are used to continuously synchronize the remote clock with the central clock. By basing the synchronization process on the bi-directional exchange of the time signals and time differences, the synchronization can be accomplished independently from the satellite position. In other words, the claimed method and system eliminate the necessity to calculate the propagation time along the transmission path in order to generate a time correction for the remote clock. *See*, pages 4-5 of the Specification.

As further discussed during the interview, the Vanderspool reference cited in the Office Action of May 15, 2007 does not disclose the bi-directional transmission of either the time signals or the calculated time differences. Instead, Vanderspool teaches that remote transmission stations 16, 18 only receive a timing signal and a time correction factor from the control station 12. Further, it would be impossible for stations 16, 18 to transmit timing signals and time correction factors back to the control station 12 because Vanderspool does not show any communication lines going from stations 16, 18 to the control station 12.

In the calibration system taught by the cited Noguchi reference, a remote station 30 transmits a telemetry signal containing a local time to a calibrating station 20. In turn, the calibrating station 20 calculates a time difference between the receive-reference time and the local time of the remote station and transmits this time difference back to the remote station. However, the remote station does not transmit any calculated time differences to the calibrating station. Further, Noguchi discloses that the calibrating station calculates the time difference, and

thus synchronizes the clock of the remote station, based on the signal propagation time (*see e.g.*, the Abstract) and not based on the bi-directional exchange of time signals and time differences, as recited in the proposed claims.

Therefore, Claims 15 and 17 are allowable over the prior art of record. Claims 3-14 and 16 depend directly or indirectly from Claims 15 and 17 and are allowable over the cited prior art at least for the same reasons as Claims 15 and 17 and, further, on their own merits.

In view of the above, it is submitted that all claims in this application are now in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding the present Amendment or wish to discuss the application generally, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney.

Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the application, allow the claims as amended and pass this case to issue.

The Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned attorney to advance prosecution of this application.

THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING SUBMITTED
ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE UNITED STATES
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE EFS FILING
SYSTEM ON
AUGUST 13, 2007

Respectfully submitted,



Robert C. Faber
Registration No.: 24,322
OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP
1180 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-8403
Telephone: (212) 596-0510

RCF:AV:db